



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/800,896	03/15/2004	Steve Sanchez	SANCHEZ #2	1502

40992 7590 11/16/2005

THOMAS R. LAMPE
BIELN, LAMPE & THOEMING
1390 WILLOW PASS ROAD, SUITE 1020
CONCORD, CA 94520

EXAMINER

LE, VU

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2613

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/800,896

Applicant(s)

SANCHEZ, STEVE

Examiner

Vu Le

Art Unit

2613

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In independent claims 1, 15 and 23, the preambles are ambiguous because they do not particularly point out or set forth a statutory class such as an apparatus or device to comply with the requirement of 35 USC 101. It is recommended the preamble be rewritten to convey either an apparatus or a device.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in-

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent; or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for the purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English.

4. **Claims 1-6, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee, US 2005/0047616 A1.**

Re claims 1-3, Lee discloses a flat panel TV system (figs. 1-10) comprising: a flat panel TV screen (22, Note: the flat panel monitor 22 is structured in a housing); a frame defining a frame opening (10/10a); and connector structure releasably connecting said frame to said flat panel TV screen with said frame surrounding said flat panel TV screen and said flat panel TV screen observable through said frame opening (para 0024, Note: brackets disclosed in Lee serve as releasable connector structure extending between said housing 22 and said frame 10/10a).

Re claims 4-6, Lee further discloses "wherein said housing includes at least one loudspeaker communicating with said frame opening" (figs. 5-8:26), and "a mat of sound transmissive material disposed over said at least one loudspeaker and blocking said at least one loudspeaker from view through said frame opening" (para 0026, i.e. a grill 34).

Re claim 23, which is substantially the same as claim 1 and further recites "a wireless receiver incorporated in said frame for receiving wireless transmissions from a transmitter operatively associated with audio/video equipment and receiving electronic signals therefrom, said receiver being operatively associated with said TV for inputting said electronic signals into said TV". The analysis and rejection of claim 1 apply here. Furthermore, the wireless receiver/transmitter refer to the remote control receiver of the flat panel TV and the remote control device, respectively. These features would have been inherent in the flat panel TV system of Lee.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 7-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Ive et al, US 5,810,461.**

Re claims 7-9, 14 Lee fails to disclose "an electronic component receptacle connected to said frame and defining a receptacle interior for receiving at least one electronic component selectively operatively associated with said flat panel TV screen" as claimed. However, Ive et al is in the same field of endeavor and makes well known an integral receptacle for housing electrical cables configured at the rear of a computer housing (figs. 1-6, Summary of the Invention, col. 2, line 6-42, Note: the cable receptacle has multiple compartments 18A-18D for housing different electrical cables from various peripheral equipment) for the purpose of organizing the cables into a neater arrangement, and to dress out the appearance of the computer housing (col. 1, line 18-20). Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Lee and Ive et al as a whole, it would have been obvious to modify the flat panel TV frame that encloses the flat panel TV to also include receptacle(s) for housing electrical cables for the benefits of neater arrangement and to dress out the appearance of the frame as suggested in Ive et al.

Re claim 10, which recites "including receptacle connector structure releasably connecting said electronic component receptacle to said frame". (See fig. 1 of Ive et al).

Re claim 11, which recites "wherein said electronic component receptacle defines a plurality of primary openings communicating with said compartment interiors and facilitating selective installation or removal of said modular electronic components". (See fig. 1 of Ive et al, e.g. element 24, also col. 2, line 10-13).

Re claim 12, which recites "wherein said electronic component receptacle additionally defines a plurality of auxiliary openings for accommodating wires extending between modular electronic components received by said compartment interiors and said flat panel TV screen". (See fig. 1 of Ive et al, e.g. element 33).

Re claim 13, which recites "additionally comprising an electrical connector receptacle for receiving a multi-outlet electrical connector employed to provide an electrical connection between said modular electronic components and a source of electricity. (See discussion in claims 7 and 11. A multi-outlet electrical connector qualifies as one of peripheral equipments. Hence, it can also be accommodated).

7. Claims 15-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee and further in view of Ive et al, US 5,810,461.

Claim 15-22 recite limitations that are covered in claims 1-14. Hence, claims 15-22 have been analyzed and rejected w/r to claims 1-14 above.

Contact

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vu Le whose telephone number is (571) 272-7332. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on (571) 272-7418. Customer Service can be reached at (571) 272-2600. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Vu Le
Primary Examiner
AU 2613
(571) 272-7332
Vu.Le@uspto.gov